

1
2
3 ALICE SVENSON,
4 Plaintiff,
5 v.
6 GOOGLE, INC., et al.,
7 Defendants.
8

9 Case No. 13-cv-04080-BLF
10
11

12 **ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT
13 GOOGLE INC. AND GOOGLE
14 PAYMENT CORPORATION'S
15 ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE
16 UNDER SEAL CONFIDENTIAL
17 INFORMATION**
18 [Re: ECF 185]

19
20 Defendants have filed an administrative motion to seal Exhibits D, E, and F to the
21 Supplemental Declaration of Charles C. Sipos in Support of Defendants Google Inc. and Google
22 Payment Corporation's (1) Reply in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment as to Plaintiff's
23 Individual Claims and (2) Reply in Support of Motion to Exclude the Testimony of Henry
24 Fishkind. The motion is GRANTED for the reasons discussed below.

25 “Historically, courts have recognized a ‘general right to inspect and copy public records
26 and documents, including judicial records and documents.’” *Kamakana v. City and Cnty. of
Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc.*, 435
U.S. 589, 597 & n.7 (1978)). Consequently, access to motions and their attachments that are
“more than tangentially related to the merits of a case” may be sealed only upon a showing of
“compelling reasons” for sealing. *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092,
1101-02 (9th Cir. 2016). Filings that are only tangentially related to the merits may be sealed
upon a lesser showing of “good cause.” *Id.* at 1097. The Court concludes that the documents in
question, which are submitted in support of Defendants’ Reply in Support of Motion for Summary

1 Judgment as to Plaintiff's Individual Claims and Reply in Support of Motion to Exclude the
2 Testimony of Henry Fishkind, are more than tangentially related to the merits. Therefore, the
3 "compelling reasons" standard applies.

4 In addition to satisfying the "compelling reasons" test, sealing motions filed in this district
5 must be "narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material." Civil L.R. 79-5(b). A party
6 moving to seal a document in whole or in part must file a declaration establishing that the
7 identified material is "sealable." Civ. L.R. 79-5(d)(1)(A). "Reference to a stipulation or
8 protective order that allows a party to designate certain documents as confidential is not sufficient
9 to establish that a document, or portions thereof, are sealable." *Id.*

10 Defendants submit the declaration of their counsel, Breena M. Roos, who states that
11 Exhibits D and E, which are excerpts of deposition testimony of Defendants' employees, disclose
12 information regarding Defendants' business matters, including Google Wallet. Roos Decl. ¶ 3,
13 ECF 185-1. Exhibit F is "an internal document that contains confidential, sensitive, and
14 proprietary information regarding Defendants' business matters, including Google Wallet." *Id.* ¶
15 4. Ms. Roos states that "Public disclosure of Defendants' confidential and proprietary information
16 reflected in Exhibits D-F would provide insight into Defendants' confidential business matters and
17 cause Defendants to suffer competitive harm." *Id.* ¶ 5. The Court has reviewed the exhibits in
18 question and finds that the deposition excerpts are narrowly tailored to exclude only sealable
19 matter.

20 The motion to seal is GRANTED.

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

23 Dated: August 15, 2016

24
25 
BETH LABSON FREEMAN
United States District Judge

26
27
28